DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 625 CS 211 652

AUTHOR Davidson, Phebe; Stephen, Naomi
TITLE Toward a Social Theory of Revision.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; *Discourse Analysis; Essays; Higher Education; *Revision (Written Composition); Secondary Education; *Social Theories; Student Writing Models; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Composition Theory; *Text Factors; Writing Strategies

ABSTRACT

Revision poses a curious problem for the theorist because it is as difficult to define as it is to direct. Not only does it imply and require re-vision, or re-seeing, but also the prior existence of a vision, a "seeing," encoded in text. The theoretical problem of revision is further exacerbated by the issues of discourse convention and intertextuality, more comprehensively described as the dialogic nature of language in all its manifestations. What is needed is to formulate a "social theory" of revision which recognizes the forces of intertextuality without dogmatizing either intertextuality or any particular set of discourse conventions, and which further accommodates the social and dialogic nature of language. Revision theory and strategy should turn more attention to the social, intertextual, and conventional forces of the discourse community which both constrain and shape a text than to the text extant. Revision can only be successful insofar as it recognizes the intertextual nature of written discourse and allows the reader into the text, tacitly making of the text a variety of social intercourse by locating the writer in a larger social context. Teachers who used these criteria in examining student texts found some patterns of relative success and failure which seem to be dependent upon the student's understanding of audience, social context, and intertextuality. (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305625

TOWARD A SOCIAL THEORY OF REVISION

Phebe Davidson, Naomi Stephen
Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Phebe Davidson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PHEBE DAVIDSON
9 Kerry Place
Flanders, N.J. 07836
(201) 927-5751

CS211652

Revision poses a curious problem for the theorist because it is as difficult to define as it is to direct. Not only does it imply and require re-vision, or re-seeing as Rich suggests in "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision," but also the prior existence of a vision, a "seeing," encoded in text. Both of these kinds of seeing, vision and revision, are still in the process of being defined. The word re-vision itself, because of its prefix, suggests a sequential arrangement consonant with Nold's 1979 position that revision constituted "the retranscribing of text already produced"(cited Faigley p.53) and with such linear models as Murray's prevision-vision-revision (Murray, 1986). In such arrangements, the writer writes and then returns to the writing (or vision encoded in the writing) with new eyes, since the writer's vision has in some way been altered subsequent to the act of writing. The logical clarity of such models is seductive, and therefore Sommers' 1980 redefinition of revision as "a sequence of changes in a composition--...[which] occur continually throughout the writing of a work"(p.380) is a little startling, as it demands that the theorist accomodate a continuing simultanaity of vision and revision prior to, during, and even after the encoding of vision into text. Thus it seems possible that the writer is revising from the moment of inception to the moment when the manuscript is finally abandoned, although the writer (and the reader) may well be revising (re-seeing, re-thinking) the text long after the writer has ceased to alter the artifact. A text may alter, then, even after the writing is completed, assimilating new meanings dependent on the interpretive contexts in which it is viewed.

The theoretical problem of revision is further exacerbated by the issues of discourse convention and intertextuality, or what might be more

comprehensively described as the dialogic nature of language in all its manifestations. As such diverse figures as Bruffee, Feldman and Olsen have reasoned, language is social in origin and function. The act of writing, as Bruffee (1984) has argued, is an entry into the human conversation which extends over all human history. This means that the text produced exists, as Porter (1986) sums it up, only in relation to other texts, and that within every text prior texts are embedded. This embedding of prior text establishes a degree of continuity which is not necessarily causal from text to text, and which makes of text a species of social discourse insofar as each text, existing in relation to other texts (prior, contemporaneous and future), is only one facet of a dialog among texts. Porter (1986) calls for the application of intertextuality to the pedagogy of teaching composition as well as to literary theory. He suggests that students "need to see writers whose products are more evidently parts of a larger process and whose work more clearly produces meaning in social contexts"(p.44), so that "we [teachers and students] regard each written product as a stage in a larger process"(p.43). This way students become "conscious of the distinctive intertextuality of the community"(p.42) and its conventions, which enables them to produce competent discourse within that community. Dillon (1981) offers a similar view in his discussion of writing in terms of conventions; texts are "governed by diverse and complex conventions [within a discourse community], and bad writing is a failure to meet a significant number of the reader's expectations"(p.18)--expectations which are formed by the intertextual recognition of such conventions.

We would suggest that the writer's narrative stance is the discernable result of the writer's own understanding of her relation

to the larger society and of the relation of her text to the larger intertextual community into which she must place her work. It is, in short, the point from which she addresses the universe of society and text. Pedagogically, this all means that the student text exists in relation to other texts of the genre, to other voices in the discourse, and to the set of discourse conventions into which it is written, and should be taught as such. It also opens the way to a theory of revision which entails re-seeing a text in terms of its intertextuality, its social context, and its success or failure in meeting "a significant number" of discourse conventions.

Our aim here is to formulate such a "social theory" of revision which recognizes the forces of intertexuality without dogmatizing either intertextuality or any particular set of discourse conventions, and which further accomodates the social and dialogic nature of language. Revision is most easily recognized by that which it produces, i.e., substantive changes in a text which occur beyond the level of simple proofreading or copy editing. We would argue that revision theory and strategy should turn more attention to the social, intertextual, and conventional forces of the discourse community which both constrain and shape a text than to the text extant. This in turn means that the concept of revision itself, far from occupying a fixed linear or even hierarchical spot somewhere in the composing process, occupies merely (if vaguely) the position of "atonceness" with composing suggested by Berthoff. For the purposes of this discussion, revision will be considered as discernible changes in the text occasioned by the continuous process of revisioning or reseeing what has been encoded (the occasion for writing), and the code or text itself.

A social theory of revision may perhaps serve to shed some light on the fact, irritating and disappointing to students and teachers alike, that extensive revision doesn't necessarily mean a better text. In the case of such "unsuccessful" revision it seems that the question to begin with is, "What do student writers see when they re-see their writing?" What comprises "re-vision" in their eyes? A simple, and unfortunate, answer is the perceived demands of the teacher who is in turn perceived as a single, isolate figure rather than a member of a discourse community. Through the hierarchy of pedagogy, the instructor becomes in fact, if not in intention, the primary reader of the student text. In the student's eyes, her own text may be related to the teacher, but not to other texts and the conventions which govern them. In such a situation, "re-vision" becomes, simply, response to teacher commentary, which is interpreted by the student as being at least directive, and most often authoritative. Although such is not a result of instructional intent, what a teacher suggests for revision strategies can be viewed by a student as divine word graven in stone. A revision suggestion such as "use detail" may be taken up by a student writer with enthusiasm, yet it still may not accomplish a great deal in the way of improving a text. In such a case the conventional expectations of the student work at cross purposes with the conventions an instructor may wish to establish for intertextual converse with the students.

The power of the teacher on student imagination is not the only reason for the divorce of revision from the social context and intertexuality of writing, however. Witte points out that "The de facto segmentation of composing by most composition textbooks...[and] the training most writing teachers have received in analyzing literary texts

has...conditioned the way teachers of writing, writing researchers, and writing students have come to think of revising"(p.253), while Dillon (1981) challenges the established method of viewing a text "bottom up"(p.7), from components to whole text within intertext. Sommers (1980) noted that student writers, congruent with this compositional pedagogy, tend to concentrate revision at a word or sentence level. The very term "revision strategies" implies a fixed set of tools or mechanisms which can be brought to bear selectively on a text--any text. And the "dominating concern for written products"(Witte, 252) in turn suggests that a text is fixed and complete so far as it goes, so that "revising as a process of composing operates exclusively on extant texts"(Witte, p.255). What student writers re-see then, is, in essence, an artifact which can only be changed on the surface level because its core is solid, neither formed by nor responsive to its social context.

The perception of "dissonance" (Sommers, 1980) which triggers revision (wherever it occurs in the writing process) is only arrived at by a comparison of intention, or vision, and execution. Although a writer's vision may continue to change, the revision of a piece of writing must still be seen as the writer's effort to match the intention of the moment. If intention is formed from the writer's own understanding of the social and dialogic nature of language and texts, and if students--and teachers--see the writing process as segmented and isolated from its intertextual and social surround (both physical and academic), then the perception of dissonance is skewed from the start. We must back up from the initial question, "What do student writers see when they re-see their writing?" to "What do student writers see in their writing to begin with?" Unsuccessful revision, we would argue, stems from incomplete vision of the

nature of the writing task itself. Witte argues for "accomodating the pretext in revising theory and research"(p.265), the "pretext" consisting of the "framing and regulating processes that govern the structure, content, and direction of...discourse comprehension and production" (p.274). He posits that a good deal of revision actually occurs in the pretextual stage, during which the writer both formulates and recognizes the "framing and regulating processes" engendered by the conventions of social and intertextual discourse. An accurate perception of "dissonance", therefore, depends largely on the writer's recognition of such conventions in order to create an accurate comparator for guaging dissonance. Successful re-vision depends on the writer's vision of the social, conventional, and intertextual constraints and forces that shape a successful text. Inevitably, these categories overlap, since all derive from the inherently social nature of language.

Revision can only be successful insofar as it recognizes the intertextual nature of written discourse and allows the reader into the text, tacitly making of the text a variety of social intercourse by locating the writer in a larger social context. As we examined texts using these criteria, we found some patterns of relative success and failure which seem to be dependent upon the student's understanding of audience, social context, and intertexuality.

A relatively unsuccessful text in these terms is the following student essay which narrates and attempts to draw conclusions about an auto accident. The text begins:

> It was a Friday night in April, Joan and I were on our way to see the Rocky Horror Picture Show. I needed to put gas in my car, the tank was almost empty as usual, so I decided to take a short cut. I had driven in this particular area only a few times, so I was not sure which street I wanted to turn down. I finally found one

> that looked right. After driving on it for a short time, about five minutes, I realized I had made a mistake. This road was dark, there were no street lights, so I turned on my high beams and began looking for someplace to turn around.

In this first paragraph, the reader is held at bay primarily by the obtrusive first person narrator. The repetitive use of the pronoun "I" (occurring on an average of once per line) serves less as a means for the writer to connect herself with the material of the essay than as a means for insulating herself from the reader. After the initial mention of Joan, the paragraph becomes a monologue of "I's" which reveals a good deal about the writer. "I" is apparently the largest social context the writer is capable of envisioning at this point in her writing, and this collapse of social context prevents the first person from resonating for the reader. The "so" sentence ("I had driven...so I was not sure...") which appears with great frequency manifests a similar failure of the writer to connect herself with events. She seems to be groping for a formula that will unify and make sense of her story, but she doesn't quite find it. The repeated "so" is used (perhaps rather wistfully) to connect the writer with a sequence of events which should be important to the narrative but which instead emerges as trivial--the qualification of "about five minutes" on the statement of driving for a short time is one instance. Again, the lack of a larger social context (how does the "five minute" qualification create intertextual meaning?) works heavily against reader engagement, as does the writer's failure to understand the demands of convention in the narrative and personal essay, or in her life. "I" is an encapsulated entity which, far from revealing the presence of the author with a relationship to other social beings in the text, offers the writer an object to hide behind.

In this essay, the sequence of events is not complex. The driver is blinded by another car's headlights and crashes into a pile of rubble. This bloodies the driver's nose, hurts Joan's knee, and damages the car to such an extent that it must be towed from the scene. Although the sequence is related with temporal, surface coherence, it fails to coalesce because it has not been shaped sufficiently by social and discourse convention within the writer's own consciousness to have meaning for either writer or reader. The writer is unable to re-tell her experience because, without knowledge of appropriate discourse conventions, she cannot achieve sufficient distance or perspective to give the narrative a satisfying shape; her undefined narrative stance is reflected in her writing. The last two paragraphs are illustrative:

> Before I knew it the police were asking me so many questions. I was confused, all I wanted to do was to go home to my parents, but I had to fill out the report. I could not even find my driver's license, my pocketbook had emptied out all over the floor of my car. The more questions they asked us the funnier the whole situation seemed to us. The panic we had felt before had disappeared. We watched as my car was taken away on a flatbed. I waved goodbye to my great white boat, a nickname my friends had given my car. I figures I was not going to be seeing her for a while.
>
> After the report was done the police drove us home. We had hoped for a fun filled Friday night, but we were back where we had started from only two hours earlier. Our parents did not take the news of our accident too well, but they calmed down after they realized that underneath all the giggling we had been shaken by the occurrences of that particular evening. The tears started flowing down my face as my mother held me. I had never been so happy to be home as I was that night.

In an effort to satisfy conventions which are only vaguely apprehended, the writer reaches first for the commonplace of hysterical humor following a scare, then for the irony of being "back where we started", and lastly for the perhaps conventionally but not fully explored or articulated commonplace of happiness at being home safe at last. The

sentences are perhaps accurate in sequential arrangement, but each narrates some discrete facet of the writer's experience. Because of the writer's tentativeness in aiming for one unified effect, the essay satisfies neither commonplace nor convention. Because there is no larger social context to give shape to the experience, the sequential relations remain fragmented; because there are neither intertextual nor social "hooks", the reader can grasp no point of entry into the text.

Yet this essay is a twice revised text into which the student has put a good deal of effort. The revision would appear to be unsuccessful if the final copy were viewed alone. The text is, however, intertextual with its own earlier versions and with an instructional text that does not appear directly on the page. Comparison of the finished essay with its earlier versions suggests that the revisions are not entirely valueless to the writer's development.

The first paragraph of the original rough draft reads:

> [It was Friday night] Joan and I were on our way to the movies. I needed to put gas in my car, [the tank was almost empty] so I decided to taked a shortcut. the road was [very] dark, [there were] no street lights so I put my high beams on. A car was approaching me I decided to turn my high beams off when I saw a car approaching me. [with its high beams on also.]
>
> (Additions bracketed)

At this stage the emendations and additions to the text, even if seen as pretextual, are revealing, occurring as they do only at the sentence level. The typed copy originally submitted for evaluation contained only this sort of pencilled-in proofreading by way of revision. This suggests that in the writer's eye the text is rendered complete by the simple act of committing it to typescript. She simply has not sufficient grasp of convention and intertextuality to perceive the dissonance in her own text. She does not yet know what the text "should" be, and has no context beyond

her own perception to use as a guide. She has apparently perceived a need to satisfy certain grammatical conventions (which she does not fully understand either), and to anchor her narrative in a particular time and place. This direction is contradicted by the second paragraph which begins, "The whole accident happened so fast, I did not realize what had occurred." The third paragraph describes the injuries to both girls and introduces the young man driving the other car (a figure which is never developed, and which is part of no stereotype or archetype which might allow the reader to make sense of it). The fourth paragraph, which describes the deplorable condition of the road, seems aimed at establishing the writer's non-culpability in the accident, and so on, to the essay's close. Each new paragraph establishes, not continuity, but a new direction, in the writer's experience.

The concluding five short paragraphs of this draft serve a number of commonplaces. The writer is overjoyed to be home. The writer understands that her father's anger is prompted by concern for her. Both Joan and the writer weep in their mothers' arms. The writer is afraid to drive, but does so at her father's wise insistence. The writer regrets the presence of her friend in this accident. The writer is haunted by thoughts of how awful it all could have been.

What is interesting about all of this is the writer's apparent determination to draw a socially condoned moral from the experience; to establish herself with reader and teacher as the good daughter and good friend who learns from her experience. For this writer, the commonplaces serve a social context which comes to hand ready-made, unstruck by her personal experience. That the commonplaces are flat stems, we suspect, less from the fact that they are commonplaces than from the fact that the

writer fails to examine them in terms of how they relate to social experience of family care and safety. Her closing "thoughts of what could have happened" sounds extremely mechanical and self-sealed.

The student, at this point in her re-vision, has merely stumbled in the general direction of coherence of text and Text--the intertext of the discourse community (Porter, 1986, p.34). She makes some attempt to achieve unity of effect in the moral commonplaces of the essay's close, but her revision remains stuck at a sentence level because her vision of the place of her text and herself is isolated from a larger social community of writers writing about scary accidents. Her perceptions of convention, intertextuality, and social context are so limited that her text remains, in a sense, a page she does not know how to read.

The revisions which follow after the essay has passed through the instructor's hands are equally revealing, coming in response to a professorial text which the student sees as being written, singly, on her own single work. To the student's credit, she goes at the renewed task of revision with a will, deleting entirely the second paragraph about the suddenness of the accident, and the later paragraphs about her return to her family and her fears. The ordering of sequence in the narrative assumes a reasonable degree of precision, larded generously with such "specifics" as the month and the name of the movie. It is easy to imagine a professorial text which asks of the student:

> "Can you show me what happened rather than telling me?"
> "Is there any way to make the accident the climax of your story?"
> "When did each thing happen?"
> "Why is this relevant?"

It is equally easy to imagine the student setting to with great good will, putting the series of events in order, getting rid of the family

stuff that is so "talky," adding concrete detail, and so on. Unfortunately, the student in hampered by her own lack of knowledge of the genre into which she is writing, of the discourse community into which she seeks entry. Her own uneasiness with other texts and with discourse conventions which serve to engage a reader now work at cross-purposes with the knowledge and intent of her instructor who can ultimately do no more than question and suggest at this stage of "re-vision" which so desperately lacks an accurate "vision". Thus, while the last revision is not an unqualified failure, neither is it a success, because the narrative doesn't satisfy the conventional expectations it creates in the reader. The writer's failure to perceive her text in relation to other texts has barred her from an understanding of narrative in a manner significant to her readers; this situation may also grow from her failure to perceive herself as a social being writing in a social context. In this last revsion, the writer has abandoned her attempt to make sense of a frightening experience and attempts instead to make it humorous. She does not, however, recognize the form of the sense is that she is trying to convey, or the incompatibility of high drama and low comedy as elements of her narrative. What emerges from the text at last is a sense of tentative confusion.

The biggest problem for the writer at this point is that the revisions are directed by the instructor, who is perceived as external to the text and to the writer. This student doesn't yet have an accurate vision of the intertextual comparator of dissonance in her text, nor does she recognize her instructor's suggestions as as but one voice in a community. When she has an adequate grasp of that larger frame, then one

can more reasonably expect a significant shift in the sort of revision she can attempt and acheive.

A case in point is another text, written by a professional, entitled "Child of the Cold War". (While there has been some recent--and just--criticism of the practice of comparing student texts with those of professional writers, we feel that, for the theoretical approach we are advocating, comparison may be useful. To go on:) This writer shows herself to be more generally conversant with the intertextual and social nature of writing to begin with. Her text shows consistent and constant revision in such contexts from the beginning of her first draft:

> When I was born my grandmother nicknamed me Bikini because the United States government exploded an atomic bomb on the Pacific Island of Bikini just about the time I appeared.

This is crossed out and modified to:

> When I was born my grandmother nicknamed me Bikini. The other news in her life that day, besides the birth of her first grandchild, was the explosion of an atomic bomb in the Pacific islands of the Bikini Atoll. [It was the first of many such nuclear tests.] Most people seem to have viewed the test [--and the others that followed it--as] as my grandmother did--interesting, even exciting, but otherwise benign. [It was decades before we learned the story of what happened to the [Bikini Islanders] inhabitants of Bikini and the surrounding islands--the dislocation, their illnesses, their deaths.] The year 1946 must have been some time to be an American--what a sense of pride, [power,] invulnerability and omnipotence, must have accompanied the end of [the war] World War II and the [possession of] monopoly on the A-bomb secret.
>
> My nickname didn't stick, thank goodness, but I was definitely a child of the nuclear age. In retrospect [it] the bomb seems always to have been there, sometimes in the background, sometimes very much in the foreground. It was particularly there in [the first grades of] elementary school, [which corresponded with] during the [hottest years of the] anxious Cold War [from 1952 or so on] years of the mid-1950s. my memories of that time are not abundant. [I can't hardly recall the birth of my sister in 1951 or who my friends were in # second grade or the name of my third-grade

> teacher. For some reason, though, I vividly remember learning to whistle on my fifth birthday, wearing my best dotted swiss dress, looking standing before a mirror. And I remember a gray jumper and a pink-and-white gingham blouse.] But I remember the A-bomb drills [and the attendant Cold War hoopla]
>
> The drills were part of a general surge in patriotism that took place in the 1950s. Of course, I didn't realize at the time that the tenor of the age was in any way unusual. I think it seemed natural to me that I brought in a quarter every Friday to [by] buy a stamp that could be pasted in a booklet that could be [used] traded, when full, for a U.S. savings bond. The stamps were red and white, I think, and buying them was not only a patriotic but a social duty. We kids had a litle competition going to see who could fill one book the fastest --a competition the school officials no doubt encouraged since it made us keep buying.
>
> (bracketed sections crossed out in original)

At first glance, most of this writer's revisions so far follow the regular "change words, cut things out" format of student revision noted by Sommmers (1980)--sentence and word-level revisions also employed by the writer of the first essay. However, almost all of these "surface" revisions stem from a larger recognition of the requirements of texts within the discourse community. Unlike the writer of the first essay, the writer of "Cold War" immediately begins to enlarge the social context of her personal, childhood experience in the shift of emphasis from herself in the first few lines to her grandmother and the other people who heard of the testing. Her change in wording from "Pacific Island of Bikini" to "the Pacific Island of the Bikini Atoll", and from "the war" to "World War II" shows her recognition of the intertextuality of her writing, and the conventions in naming that have grown out of common discussion. Similarly, her crossing out the sentence, "It was the first of many such tests", signals her grasp of the fact that as a writer she is contributing to a pool of common knowledge, and that within this pool such information is superfluous ballast. The deletion of the sentence beginning "It was

decades before..." shows her ability to manipulate the storytelling convention of "Don't reveal too much too soon" along with her ability to understand how informational statement can create intertextual ties between text and context. Such information can come later, where it gives social form and meaning to personal reminiscence.

The essay goes on to describe the A-bomb drills and the fear, followed by apathy, that they engendered in the children. It is interesting that this writer uses a commonplace of human experience (familiarity breeding contempt) similar to that which the first writer employs (hysterical humor following a scare). Yet in "Child of the Cold War" the commmonplace "works" because it carries intertextual definition. The inital fear and subsequent apathy work with general information about the devastating effects of the Bomb to encapsulate the writer's attitudes of disgust and distrust toward the authorities who dictated such useless and panic-engendering measures. She thus creates a larger social judgement within her own experience, and forms intertextual ties to the knowledge and attitudes of the discourse community toward the Cold War years. The commonplace works within the essay because it works outside of the essay, in the social context beyond text.

The paragraphs in this first draft are modified through another draft to the final text which reads:

CHILD OF THE COLD WAR

When I was born my grandmother nicknamed me Bikini. The other news that day in 1946, besides the birth of her first grandchild, was the test explosion of an atomic bomb in the Pacific Islands of the Bikini Atoll. The nickname didn't last, thank goodness, but the nuclear age did. For anyone born since World War II, the bomb has always been present, somtimes in the background, sometimes very much in the foreground. For me and others my age, the bomb was most present in

> elementary school, during the Cold War years of the 1950s.
>
> I didn't realize at the time that the patriotism and anxiety of the age were unusual. I think it seemed natural to take a quarter to school every Friday, buy a stamp, and paste it in a booklet that could be traded, when full, for a U.S. savings bond. The stamps were red and white with a blue star, and buying them was not only a patriotic but a social duty. We kids had a competition going to see who could fill a book the fastest --a competition the school officials encouraged, probably because it made us keep buying.

In this draft, much of the closed, personal reminiscence is opened --the phrase "The year 1946 must have been some time to be an American" is simply compressed to the date, 1946, which is all the community needs to draw the same conclusions that the writer draws in her original, highly personal, speculation. In the same fashion "In retrospect" and "Of course" in the second and third paragraphs are eliminated in accordance with the conventions of not telling what is either obvious or redundant. The elimination of these phrases and the "I think"s that follow also serves to open the text by removing the writer's closed resonance of judgement and memory, and allowing the reader to form his or her own from context. These are all refined revisions of the initial vision--or revision--of her Cold War experience apparent in the first draft. When she deletes the section in the first draft beginning, "I can't hardly recall...", she is aware of the fact that she is insulating herself from the reader and the social discourse in which reader and writer both participate. From the very beginning, she is conversant with a crucial essay-writing convention: stick to the point--or rather, make your experience work with the point. What is the point?

The last two paragraphs of the final text read:

> Then why the drills for schoolchildren? I think we were pawns in the war of nerves between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Our government was exaggerating and even

> inventing dangers to justify its own Cold War agression and to generate support for mammoth increases in military spending. And what more effective way to fan the hysteria than to scare schoolchildren? My mother knew better than to be frightened: she could joke about the ironing board as bomb shelter. But for a while my classmates and I did not know better, and we were terrified.
>
> When I protested the war in Vietnam a decade later I'm sure I never consciously thought back to those scary moments under my desk. But somehow they contributed to my feelings of distrust and anger toward those conducting the war--and since then toward others conducting other ventures, other power plays. The Cold War was largely an illusion masking the truth of responsibility for the Bomb, and to both the illusion and the truth I owe a healthy scepticism of authority.

The point of the whole essay is to add to the intertextual pool of knowledge (and, perhaps, distrust) of the Cold War years. The writer's personal experience is the vehicle into the context of that discussion, even while the experience <u>is</u> the context of that discussion. There is a constant dialogue between writer and intertextual, social, discourse community in this essay which is almost completely lacking in the first essay. The writer of "Cold War" has a firm grasp on the conventions of such discourse from the beginning; the conventions serve to both constrain the form of the text and to shape and unify the writer's experience in her own consciousness and the social discourse consciousness of the reader (and writer). This writer's own initial perception of dissonance is based on the "instructional" voices from a discourse community which she is already aware of. Her "re-vision" of her text springs <u>with</u> (not necessarily <u>from</u>) her "vision" or "pretext" composed of and with the framing and regulating conventions of social and intertextual discourse. In "Child of the Cold War" much exists that is missing in the untitled student essay (even the presence of a title indicates one more species of familiarity with discourse convention). The writer of "Cold War" is

writing into conventions of personal narrative and reflection with considerable breadth of vision. Even in the first draft, she seems to perceive the events of her life as elements of a larger social contexts of school, community, and world, and she is able both to use her experience to analyze those contexts, and to use the contexts to give shape to her experience. The social constraints supply dimension for the "I" of the text (and the eye of the writer) and thus invite reader participation. In this respect she is at odds with the writer of the first essay, whose passing mentions of school and family fall away from the repeated "I" like so much excess baggage. The barrier of the first person singular is neither formed by nor penetrates the social context of discourse, and thus the reader is alienated from the text--it is more difficult even to discuss in concrete terms where her "re-vision" is unsuccessful, so amorphous is the vision in her writing.

The narrative voice of "Child of the Cold War", unlike that of the first essay, interacts with other voices in the discourse. The text is able to perform dialogically because its author is conversant with a significant number of discourse conventions and with social context as implicated in her own experience, which is, in itself, a kind of intertextuality. In these terms, successful re-vision grows from a writer's increasingly refined vision of such intertextuality.

WORKS CITED

Bruffee, Kenneth A.: "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'," College English, 46:7 (November 1984) 635-52.

Dillon, George L.: Constructing Texts (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981).

Faigley, L.: "Research on Revision", Research on Writers' Knowledge and Processes of Composing (Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1985) 53-66.

Feldman, Carol: "Two Functions of Language," Harvard Educational Review, 7:3 (August 1977) 282-93.

Porter, James: "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community", Rhetoric Review, 5:1 (Fall 1986) 34-45.

Rich, Adrienne: "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision", On Lies, Secrets, and Silence (New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1979) 33-49.

Sommers, Nancy: "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers", College Composition and Communication, 31:4 (December 1980) 378-87.

Witte, Stephen P.: "Revising, Composing Theory, and Research Design," The Acquisition of Written Language: Response and Revision, ed. Sarah Warshauer Freedman (Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1985) 250-84.